REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 8, 12, and 14-17 have been amended. New dependent claim 32

has been added. Claims 1-4, 8-12, 14-17, 20-21 and 32 are pending in the

application. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Applicants' counsel wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies

extended during the personal interview on July 7, 2010. The following records

the substance of the interview.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-4, 8-10 and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

obvious over Nakano et al. (EP 1 134 674) in view of Ogaki et al. (US

2002/0059024). Further, claims 11-12 were rejected as being obvious over

Nakano et al. in view of Ogaki et al. and further in view of Wilson et al. (US

6,985,929). Finally, claims 14-17 were rejected as being obvious over Nakano et

al. in view of Narahara (US 2002/0007367).

As discussed in the interview, Applicants respectfully traverse these

rejections in view of the following remarks and claim amendments. In that

regard, Applicants incorporate herein their prior remarks submitted with the

Reply dated January 7, 2010.

Page 13 of 21

Amendments to Independent Claims 1, 8 and 14

As suggested by the Examiner during the interview, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 14 to specify that divided map-related information (for example, a set of mesh data 182 in Fig. 4) includes basic data (for example, 112 in Fig. 4) and extension data (for example, 114 in Fig. 4). As recited in amended claim 1, the basic data is "available at all levels," corresponding to one of a plurality of different scaling factors at which the map is rendered, while the extension data is "available at one or more specific levels but not all levels." The basic data and the extension data being provided separately from each other. The basic data is used to display the map at a display device, and the extension data contains information used in route search.

Per claim 14, the divided map-related information corresponding to each of the units is also separated into basic data and extension data to be individually managed. The basic data has a "higher priority than the extension data." The basic data is "prepared in order not to exceed a predetermined upper data size limit." A processing unit executes processing of the map data by using the divided map-related information where the basic data is prepared in order not to exceed the predetermined upper data size limit.

Regarding Applicants' independent claim 8, because this claimed invention is directed toward the processing of the map data by using two-dimensional coordinate values at a given level to which is attached two-

dimensional coordinate values of a connecting point at a level at which the map

is rendered in greater detail, Applicants have specified that the map-related

information comprises "data used in route search." Applicants have also added a

dependent claim 32 specifying that the divided map-related information

corresponding to each of the units comprises basic data available at all levels and

extension data available at one or more specific levels but not all levels.

Independent Claim 1

Applicants' independent claim 1 recites a map data processing apparatus

including, inter alia, a processing unit that updates map-related information

recorded in a recording medium by using update data obtained by an update

data acquisition unit and management information. A plurality of levels is

defined, each in correspondence to one of a plurality of different scaling factors at

which the map is rendered. A plurality of sets of the map-related information is

provided in correspondence to the plurality of levels. Applicants have clarified

claim 1 to specify that the map is divided into a plurality of divisions at each

level, and each of the plurality of sets of map-related information, corresponding

to a given level, is divided into units corresponding to the plurality of divisions

into which the map is divided. The divided map-related information

corresponding to each of the units comprises basic data available at all levels and

extension data available at one or more specific levels but not all levels. The

Page 15 of 21

basic data and the extension data are provided separately from each other. The

basic data is used to display the map at a display device, and the extension data

contains information used in route search.

In contrast and as discussed during the interview, the passage of Nakano

cited in the Office Action relating to Figure 33 makes clear that Nakano does not

disclose basic data available at all levels and extension data available at one or

more specific levels but not all levels, wherein the basic data is used to display

the map at a display device and the extension data contains information used in

route search. Indeed, Nakano only discloses "figure 33 is a diagram showing the

concept of the route search operation" in paragraph [0139] (emphasis added).

That is, Figure 33 is not an actual display at a display device, but rather a

representative diagram illustrating conceptually a route search operation.

Because Nakano fails to disclose or suggest the above features of claim 1

as discussed during the interview, Applicants submit claim 1 is patentable over

Nakano. Further, claims 2-4 and 20-21 depend from claim 1 and are also

submitted to be patentable. In that regard, dependent claims 2-4 have been

amended for definiteness in light of the clarifying amendments made to claim 1.

Hence, claims 1-4 and 20-21 are patentable over Nakano, whether taken

alone or in combination with Ogaki.

Page 16 of 21

Independent Claim 8

Applicants have amended claim 8 to recite a map data processing apparatus that includes, inter alia, a recording medium drive unit that receives a recording medium where are recorded map data including a structure having map-related information, and a structure having management information for the map-related information. The map-related information comprises data used in route search. The map is divided into a plurality of divisions at each level, and each of the plurality of sets of map-related information, corresponding to a given level, is divided into units corresponding to the plurality of divisions into A connection point, at which the map-related which the map is divided. information corresponding to one of two divisions is correlated to the map-related information corresponding to the other division, is present at a geographically matching position within the two divisions. The two divisions belong to levels different from each other. Two-dimensional coordinate values of the connecting point at a given level further contain two-dimensional coordinate values of a connection point at a level at which the map is rendered in greater detail than the given level. The processing unit executes processing of the map data by using the two-dimensional coordinate values of the connecting point.

In contrast and as discussed during the interview, the Office Action's reliance on Ogaki for allegedly disclosing the two-dimensional coordinate values of the connecting point at a given level further containing two-dimensional

Attorney Docket No. 029267.55611US

coordinate values of a connecting point at a level at which the map is rendered in

greater detail than the given level, is incorrect. Indeed, Ogaki merely discloses

the naming of a map file name (see $\P\P$ [0127] – [0134]) and the naming of a floor

map file name (see ¶ [0164]). Ogaki does not disclose how to define "two-

dimensional coordinate values of the connecting point" as in Applicants'

invention.

Because Ogaki does not disclose or suggest the use of "two-dimensional

coordinate values of a connecting point at a level at which the map is rendered in

greater detail than the given level," it is not possible for Ogaki to render obvious

Applicants' claimed invention wherein "two-dimensional coordinate values of the

connecting point at a given level further contain two-dimensional coordinate

values of the connecting point at a level at which the map is rendered in greater

detail than the given level."

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit claim 8 is patentable

over Nakano in view of Ogaki. Further, claims 9-12 depend from claim 8 and are

also patentable over Nakano in view of Ogaki.

Finally, Applicants have added new dependent claim 32, which depends

from claim 8, and further specifies that the divided map-related information

corresponding to each of the units comprises basic data available at all levels and

extension data available at one or more specific levels but not all levels. The

Page 18 of 21

basic data is used to display the map at a display device, and the extension data

contains the data used in route search.

In view of the patentability of claim 8, as well as the patentability of claim

1 containing this feature, Applicants respectfully submit new dependent claim 32

is also patentable over Nakano in view of Ogaki.

Independent Claim 14

Claim 14 recites a map data processing apparatus including, inter alia, a

processing unit that updates map-related information by using update data and

management information. The map-related information is divided into units

corresponding to a plurality of divisions into which the map is divided. The

divided map-related information corresponding to each of the units is separated

into basic data and extension data to be individually managed. The basic data

has a higher priority than the extension data. The basic data is prepared in

order not to exceed a predetermined upper data size limit. The processing unit

executes processing of the map data by using the divided map-related

information where the basic data is prepared in order not to exceed the

predetermined upper data size limit.

In contrast and as discussed during the interview, the assertion in the

Office Action that Narahara discloses the feature of the basic data prepared in

Page 19 of 21

Serial No. 10/514,423

Amendment Dated: August 6, 2010

Reply to Office Action Mailed: March 11, 2010

Attorney Docket No. 029267.55611US

order not to exceed a predetermined upper data size limit is incorrect. The

passage recited in the Office Action, i.e.

[0109], only references "a size reduction process to reduce a size of a

selected element" in Narahara's system. Narahara's system, however is not at

all related to a map data processing apparatus that allows for system updates,

but rather just a device or system for processing document information (see ¶

[0002]). Even then, Narahara does not disclose that its size reduction process is

performed to reduce a size of a selected element having higher priority than

another element.

Indeed, it is not at all apparent as to how one skilled in the art would

utilize the teachings of Narahara in combination with Nakano in order to arrive

at Applicants' invention. Even selective picking and choosing based on hindsight

does not render a map data processing apparatus as recited in claim 14.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit amended claim 14 is

patentable over Nakano in view of Narahara. Further, claims 15-17 depend from

claim 14 and recite further features not disclosed or suggested by the art of

record. Hence, Applicants submit claims 14-17 are now in condition for

allowance.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit all pending claims are now in

condition for allowance. An early notice to the effect is solicited.

Page 20 of 21

Serial No. 10/514,423

Amendment Dated: August 6, 2010

Reply to Office Action Mailed: March 11, 2010

Attorney Docket No. 029267.55611US

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323, Docket No. 029267.55611US.

Respectfully submitted,

August 6, 2010

effrey D. Sanok

Registration No. 32,169

CROWELL & MORING LLP Intellectual Property Group P.O. Box 14300 Washington, DC 20044-4300

Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500 Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844

JDS:njr dn#12823478 1